



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

omissions. Various meanings of the same word are classified, with the references following each. The alphabetical order is strictly followed with one exception, which is that *ð* medial and final follows *t*, instead of taking its alphabetical place as *th*; *æ*, however, properly follows *ad*. The addition of cross-references from the second element of compounds would have added comparatively little to the bulk of the book, and would have greatly facilitated certain kinds of investigation.

Dr. Simons has done a useful piece of work, for which all Old English scholars will be grateful; but he might easily have increased its value by including Parts I and III of the *Christ*, even if he had distinguished words from this source by a difference of type: and he might have done well to enclose references to the *Andreas* in brackets, though the discrimination will cause no particular trouble to those who decline to attribute the *Andreas* to Cynewulf. Dr. Simons' example might profitably be followed by others. Special glossaries are urgently needed in every part of the field of Old and Middle English, and in their favor we could willingly forego, at least for the moment, the flood of laboriously futile dissertations on questions of disputed authorship. When we have sufficiently exact and comprehensive studies on language, the inquiry into authorship may be resumed with much better chances of attaining solid results than at present.

ALBERT S. COOK.

YALE UNIVERSITY.
Nov. 27, 1899.

Les Passions Allemandes du Rhin dans leur Rapport avec l'ancien Théâtre Français, par M. Wilmotte. Paris, 1898. 114 p. 8°.

WILMOTTE, in this study of the German religious drama of the middle ages in its relation to the French drama, has taken up a line of thought suggested by Mone over half a century ago. After summing up the views of Mone, he considers briefly those of the chief authorities of more recent date, as Wirth, Froning, and Creizenach, criticising their apparent indifference to the question of French influence and also objecting to their classification of the German plays.

The body of Wilmotte's book consists of two parts, first a study of the inter-relationship of the German plays of what

he calls the Rhenish group, and second, a discussion of the French influence upon the plays of this group. He limits himself to the scenes preceding the betrayal, reserving the passion and death of Christ for a later study. His chief conclusions from the comparative study of the German plays are:—That the Eger and Donaueschingen plays do not occupy the isolated positions to which Creizenach would assign them but belong to the Rhenish group, being especially related to the St. Gall play; that this sub-group of three and the Frankfurt-Alsfeld-Heidelberg group, or rather sub-group, (briefly called the Frankfurt group) and the Maestricht play and the Vienna play constitute the Rhenish group and all go back to a common prototype *x*, which has not been preserved. He gives especial prominence to the Maestricht play as being the oldest of the Rhenish plays, except perhaps the Vienna fragment, and as standing nearest to the assumed prototype.

As Wilmotte's conclusions are based largely upon the more or less perfect parallelism between the texts, the question of their validity is closely connected with the general question of the parallel passage method in its application to the religious drama. This method must be applied with much care, for it must not be forgotten that the Bible was a common source upon which the dramatists could always draw independently of each other, and hence that agreements which are no greater than might be expected from this common Scriptural basis cannot be used to establish a connection between plays. This fact is not sufficiently heeded by Wilmotte. Most of the parallel passages which he cites have only that general agreement in substance or slight similarity in form which is easily explicable by the common Biblical source. As a result there does not seem to me to remain sufficient really significant evidence to support his conclusions regarding the interrelationship of the Rhenish plays. Attention should be called to several demonstrable inaccuracies in his classification of the plays as he represents it schematically on p. 49. He indicates the play represented by the Frankfurt *Dirigierrolle* as the most immediate common source of the Alsfeld, the Heidelberg and the later Frankfurt play, whereas Froning has shown (p. 334-35) that they must be based upon a revised form of that earlier play. He further indicates that all three plays go back

independently to their common source, although Mansholt in his study of the Künzelsau play (p. 48) has shown cogent textual reasons for assuming that the Heidelberg and the later Frankfurt play, at least in the Mary Magdalene scene, are more closely related to each other than they are to the Alsfeld play, and so must have had as a common source a revision of the play which served as a source of the Alsfeld play. Further he fails to indicate the direct obligations of the later Frankfurt play to the St. Gall play.

It is well known that the plays of the Frankfurt group have numerous and extensive passages which are taken literally from the *Erlösung*, an epic religious poem of the 13th century. Wilmotte uses some of these passages for comparison with corresponding passages from the other Rhenish plays (pp. 39-40, 40-41) to support his theory of their origin from a common prototype, without mentioning the improbable corollaries which his reasoning carries with it. A first corollary would be that the borrowing from the *Erlösung* was done not within the Frankfurt group but by the prototype x , although none of the other Rhenish plays, supposed to come from x , not even the old Maestricht play, shows any really convincing traces of the *Erlösung*. Another corollary would be that these passages of the Frankfurt plays which agree practically word for word with the *Erlösung* represent likewise with literal exactness the text of x , whence it could be reasonably supposed that other passages of the Frankfurt plays had preserved the text of x with similar fidelity and that these plays, rather than the Maestricht play, represent most closely the assumed prototype.

Another place where Wilmotte's method is very questionable is in his discussion of the Mary Magdalene scene, where he draws inferences regarding x from a comparison of the Maestricht play with passages from the later plays of the Frankfurt group which are not found in the earlier one, the one represented by the *Dirigierrolle*. The later ones are based upon the earlier one and their additions to it could not have descended from x by regular transmission.

In the second part of Wilmotte's book, his discussion of French influence upon the Rhenish plays, the chief conclusions are, that the French religious drama had considerable

influence upon the prototype x , and also influenced the Maestricht, Alsfeld and Heidelberg plays in scenes which do not go back to x . He shows French influence in the Maestricht play, and makes it at least very probable in the Alsfeld play. The evidence for the Heidelberg play is not so convincing. Of all his juggling with the prototype x I am extremely sceptical.

An example will illustrate well the difficulties with which he has to deal. On p. 75 he cites the parallelisms:

vers la mer adressez vos pas
et nagez jusqu'à vostre terre

(*Gréban*, 6812-6813).

Ich wil euch weisen ein andern weg,
Der euch furt an des mœres steg;
So schiffit ir sicher in eur landt

(*Eger*, 2199-2201).

adding 'Ici la tradition n'intervient pas et l'imitation (i. e., the imitation of French models by x) est flagrante.' This inference of flagrant imitation presupposes, first, the validity of the theory of a common origin x for the Rhenish plays; second, that this passage from Eger, although it occurs in no other play and although Eger dates from the latter part of the 15th century, may yet represent x , the hypothetical prototype of the 13th century; third, that the passage from Gréban's play, an elaborate drama of 34575 lines dating from the middle of the 15th century, goes back to an assumed early and simple French play antedating the prototype x ; fourth, that the feature of returning by sea was borrowed from such a French play and not from the Latin theological literature, where it occurs (see Creizenach, p. 359), or from mediaeval art, where the Magi are sometimes represented as returning by sea. This example is a typical one; most of Wilmotte's proofs of French influence upon x require either the same or equally questionable presuppositions.

One more passage should be cited to show a case where his over-fondness for constructive theorizing leads him into demonstrable error. In discussing French influence upon the prophet play of x he says (p. 64-65):

Pour Ysaïas, la question se complique un peu, car Francfort et Eger fournissent un double parallèle. Toutefois nous n'avons plus que le premier vers du discours d'Ysaïas dans le livret de scène de Francfort, et à la différence de ce que nous constatons pour les autres prophètes, ce vers ne coïncide pas avec le début du passage correspondant dans le texte de 1493 :

Wer geloubit uns, herre, nu zu hant?

(*Frft. dirigierrolle*.)

Wir hain en gesehen zu eyner frist

(1493.)

C'est peut-être à cette circonstance qu'il faut attribuer les divergences profondes que l'on note entre ce dernier texte et le drame d'*Adam*. . . .

Et si nous revenons au texte même des prophéties, Eger, autre rameau issu de *x*, nous apportera des similitudes décisives, que rien ne nous interdit de restituer, à titre conjectural, au texte perdu de Baldemar von Peterweil:

En somme, il ne serait peut-être pas trop malaisé de reconstituer le défilé des prophètes, tel que l'a connu *x*.

The entire speech of Isaiah in the Frankfurt play of 1493 is from the *Erlösung*, beginning with *Erlös*. v. 2064. Now *Erlös*. v. 2060 reads: Wer gloubt uns herre nu zuhant. This is the line which the *Dirigierrolle* has. Hence the speech in the *Dirigierrolle* and in the text of 1493 was the same except that the latter, probably by oversight of the scribe, omitted the first four lines, and Wilmotte's far-reaching conjectures fall to the ground. A single case like this, where the error may be clearly shown, throws suspicion upon the many cases which seem equally improbable but cannot be directly disproved.

In conclusion it must be said that Wilmotte's book, although a very suggestive study of important phases of the mediaeval religious drama, is not executed with the care and thoroughness which are required by the difficulty of the problems involved.

NEIL C. BROOKS.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea. With Introduction and Notes by James Taft Hatfield. The MacMillan Company: New York, 1899.

'THE best that can be done is to put a pure text into the hands of an inspired and thoroughly equipped interpreter, and allow it to do its own work.' These words from page IV of Prof. Hatfield's *Preface* cannot be emphasized too much. Whether it is the question of a classic which fills us with reverence, or a German Reader that is used merely to give some elementary knowledge of the language to beginners, we want first of all a pure text. Different persons may in individual cases have different views as to the fitness, qualitatively, or quantitatively, of an introduction or of notes. But all